REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application. The specification is amended to make correction to a typographical error. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claims 1-9 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being anticipated Date et al. ("A Guide to SQL/DS"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Date shows one or more insert statements inserted into the source program at page 134, and an insert parser that determines the state of the logical condition at page 27 and 38 and Figure 2.34. Applicants respectfully disagree. In Date, the INSERT statement is merely used as an SQL update statement. In the example, provided at page 134, reproduced below, there is a logical condition statement and logical parameters; however, there are no state statements. Instead, Date shows:

```
INSERT
INTO        OJEX
            SELECT    S.*., 'BB'
            FROM      S
            WHERE     NOT EXISTS
                   ( SELECT *
                     FROM       SP
                     WHERE      SP.S# =S.S#   )
```

In this statement, the "WHERE NOT" statement is the logical condition statement and the "WHERE SP..." statement is the logical parameter. However, Date's INSERT statement does not have the form of the claimed invention; that is, the INSERT statement does not include:

.... one or more logical condition statements with one or
more logical parameters and one or more state statements.

Also, using the example espoused by the Examiner at page 134 of Date, it is evident that the INSERT statement is merely a retrieval statement. This INSERT statement is not designed for dynamic integration of content and form. There is no indication, whatsoever, Date's INSERT statement maintains control over the placement decision of form and content in a unified presentation while allowing separate requirements on content and form to drive that decision. Instead, using the example at page 134, Date's INSERT statement is used to find

> ....each supplier, get the supplier number, name, status, and city, together with part numbers for all parts supplied by that supplier, If a given supplier supplies no parts at all, then show the information for that supplier in the result concatenated with a blank part number.

However, the INSERT statement is an update statement. It is not a retrieval statement. So, there is no showing of the data, such as the table shown on page 135 of DATE. To show this data, a separate select statement must be used. As such, this is totally irrelevant to the one or more insert statements inserted into the source program file of the claimed invention.

Date also does not show an insert parser, capable of the functionality and methodology of the claimed invention. The "so-called" parser of Date is a preprocessor which examines the SQL statements in the source module, parses them and reports on any syntax errors. It can also be used to replace each SQL statement by a PL/I CALL statement, which passes control to the RDS when it is executed at run time. The parser of Date does not parse selected state statement into one or more content source indicators.

Amongst other features, the Examiner is also of the opinion that Date shows a content insertion process in section 8.2.5 and Figures 2.2 and 2.3. Again, section 8.2.5 is referring to an INSERT statement for each supplier, get the supplier number, name, status, and city, together with part numbers for all parts supplied by that supplier, If a given supplier supplies no parts at

all, then show the information for that supplier in the result concatenated with a blank part number. The INSERT statement of Date is not a content insertion process that replaces the insert statement with the content accessed from the content source object referred to by the indicators in the source program file as claimed.

Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are allowable based on their dependencies from respective independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Date in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,742,845 to Wagner. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the dependent claim 10 is allowable based on its dependencies from allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claim 10 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew M. Calderon
Registration No. 38,093

Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone: 703-716-1191
Facsimile: 703-716-1180